

An Indicator Function Limit Theorem in Dynamical Systems

Olivier Durieu* & Dalibor Volný†

November 5, 2009

Abstract

We show by a constructive proof that in all aperiodic dynamical system, for all sequences $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $a_n \nearrow \infty$ and $\frac{a_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, there exists a set $A \in \mathcal{A}$ having the property that the sequence of the distributions of $(\frac{1}{a_n} S_n(\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A)))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is dense in the space of all probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$. This extends the result of [5] to the non-ergodic case.

Keywords: Dynamical system; Ergodicity; Sums of random variables; Limit theorem.

AMS classification: 28D05; 60F05; 60G10.

1 Introduction and result

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a probability space where Ω is a Lebesgue space and let T be an invertible measure preserving transformation from Ω to Ω . We say that $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ is a dynamical system. Further, the dynamical system is aperiodic if

$$\mu\{x \in \Omega : \exists n \geq 1, T^n x = x\} = 0.$$

It is ergodic if for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $T^{-1}A = A$ implies $\mu(A) = 0$ or 1.

For a random variable X from Ω to $\mathbb{R}$, we denote by $S_n(X)$ the partial sums $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} X \circ T^i$, $n \geq 1$.

The present paper concerns the question of the limit behavior of partial sums in general aperiodic dynamical systems. In 1987, Burton and Denker [2] proved that in any aperiodic dynamical system, there exists a function in L_0^2 which verifies the central limit theorem. In general, for functions in L^p spaces, Volný [7] proved that for any sequence $a_n \rightarrow \infty$,

*Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Physique Théorique, UMR 6083 CNRS, Université François Rabelais, Tours; e-mail: olivier.durieu@lmpt.univ-tours.fr

†Laboratoire de Mathématiques Raphaël Salem, UMR 6085 CNRS, Université de Rouen; e-mail: dalibor.volny@univ-rouen.fr

$\frac{a_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$, there exists a dense G_δ part G of L_0^p such that for any $f \in G$ the sequence of distributions of $\frac{1}{a_{n_k}} S_{n_k}(f)$ is dense in the set of all probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$, see also Liardet and Volný [6]. This work is also related to the question of the rate of convergence in the ergodic theorem (see del Junco and Rosenblatt [3]).

In Durieu and Volný [5], a similar result is shown for the class of centered indicator functions $\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A)$, $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and for ergodic dynamical systems. The following theorem was obtained.

Theorem 1 *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ be an ergodic dynamical system on a Lebesgue probability space, $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ be an increasing sequence such that $a_n \nearrow \infty$ and $\frac{a_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

There exists a dense (for the pseudo-metric of the measure of the symmetric difference) G_δ class of sets $A \in \mathcal{A}$ having the property that for every probability ν on $\mathbb{R}$, there exists a subsequence $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{a_{n_k}} S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A)) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \nu.$$

Here, we answer the question of the existence of a similar result in the non-ergodic case.

Assume now that $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ is not ergodic. Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ be an increasing sequence satisfying $a_n \nearrow \infty$ and $\frac{a_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Denote by $\mathcal{I}$ the σ -algebra of the invariant sets and $(\mu^x)_{x \in \chi}$ the ergodic components of the measure μ . If there exist a set $A \in \mathcal{A}$, a probability measure ν on $\mathbb{R}$ and a sequence $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{a_{n_k}} S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A)) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \nu,$$

then $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_A | \mathcal{I}) = \mu(A)$ almost surely.

Indeed, if there exists $x \in \chi$ such that $\mu^x(A) - \mu(A) = c > 0$, then by Birkhoff's Ergodic Theorem,

$$\frac{1}{n} S_n(\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} c$$

μ^x -almost surely. Therefore

$$\frac{1}{a_{n_k}} S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A)) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} +\infty$$

and we have a contradiction.

So, to find a set which satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 1, we have to consider the sets A such that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_A | \mathcal{I})$ is almost surely constant. The class of such sets is not, in general, dense in $\mathcal{A}$. So, in the non-ergodic case, we cannot expect the result of genericity.

Nevertheless, in the non-ergodic case, one can show the existence of an arbitrarily small set $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that the sequence of the distributions of $\left(\frac{1}{a_n} S_n(\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A)) \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is dense in the set of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$.

We prove the following result.

Theorem 2 *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ be an aperiodic dynamical system on a Lebesgue probability space and $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ be an increasing sequence such that $a_n \nearrow \infty$ and $\frac{a_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a set $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mu(A) < \varepsilon$ such that for every probability measure ν on $\mathbb{R}$, there exists a sequence $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{a_{n_k}} S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A)) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \nu.$$

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2. Note that the proof that we propose is constructive.

2 Proof

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ be an aperiodic dynamical system and $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ be an increasing sequence such that $a_n \nearrow \infty$ and $\frac{a_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ which are fixed for all the sequel.

2.1 An equivalent statement

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of all probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{M}_0$ be the set of all probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ which have zero-mean. We denote by d the Lévy metric on $\mathcal{M}$. For all μ and ν in $\mathcal{M}$ with distribution functions F and G ,

$$d(\mu, \nu) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : G(t - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon \leq F(t) \leq G(t + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

The space $(\mathcal{M}, d)$ is a complete separable metric space and convergence with respect to d is equivalent to weak convergence of distributions (see Dudley [4], pages 394-395). If $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a random variable, we denote by $\mathcal{L}_\Omega(X)$ the distribution of X on $\mathbb{R}$. Using the separability of the set $\mathcal{M}_0$ which is dense in $\mathcal{M}$, we can prove that the next theorem is equivalent to Theorem 2.

Theorem 3 *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and for every sequence $(\nu_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{M}_0$, there exist a set $A \in \mathcal{A}$, with $\mu(A) < \varepsilon$, and a sequence $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that*

$$d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_k}} S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A))), \nu_k) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Proposition 2.1 *Theorem 3 and Theorem 2 are equivalent.*

Proof.

Let M be a countable and dense subset of $\mathcal{M}_0$. We can find a sequence $(\nu_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for all $\eta \in M$, there exists an infinite set $K_\eta \subset \mathbb{N}$ verifying that for all $k \in K_\eta$, $\nu_k = \eta$.

Let A be the set and $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence associated to the sequence $(\nu_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ as in Theorem 3.

For each $\nu \in M$, there exists an increasing sequence $(k_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\nu_{k_j} = \nu$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By Theorem 3,

$$d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_{k_j}}} S_{n_{k_j}}(\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A))), \nu) \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

By classical argument, Theorem 2 follows.

The fact that Theorem 2 implies Theorem 3 is clear. $\square$

Now to prove Theorem 3, we will construct explicitly the set A . To do that, we will use the four following lemmas.

2.2 Auxiliary results

Let ν be a probability on $\mathbb{R}$. For $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\nu(B) > 0$, ν_B denotes the probability on $\mathbb{R}$ defined by $\nu_B(A) = \nu(B)^{-1} \nu(A \cap B)$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, ν_x denotes the probability on $\mathbb{R}$ defined by $\nu_x(B) = \nu(\{xb / b \in B\})$.

Lemma 2.2 *Some properties of the Lévy metric:*

- (i) *For each probability ν on $\mathbb{R}$, for all Borel sets B , $d(\nu_B, \nu) \leq \nu(\mathbb{R} \setminus B)$.*
- (ii) *For all probabilities ν and η on $\mathbb{R}$, for all $x \geq 1$, $d(\nu_x, \eta_x) \leq d(\nu, \eta)$.*
- (iii) *For all probability ν on $\mathbb{R}$, for all measurable functions f and g from Ω to $\mathbb{R}$,*

$$d(L_\Omega(f + g), \nu) \leq (L_\Omega(f), \nu) + d(L_\Omega(g), \delta_0)$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac measure at 0.

- (iv) *For all probability ν on $\mathbb{R}$, $d(\nu, \delta_0) \leq A$ if and only if $\nu((-\infty, -A)) \leq A$ and $\nu((A, \infty)) \leq A$.*

The proof is left to the reader.

Lemma 2.3 *For all probability ν on $\mathbb{R}$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C_0 \geq 1$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $C \geq C_0$ and $n \geq n_0$, there exists a probability η on $\mathbb{R}$ with support $S \subset [-a_n C, a_n C] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ such that for all $i \in S$, $\eta(\{i\}) \in \mathbb{Q}$, $d(\eta_{a_n}, \nu) \leq \varepsilon$ and $\mathbb{E}(\eta) := \int x d\eta(x) = 0$.*

Proof.

This Lemma is a consequence of Lemma 3.3 in [5] (which has a constructive proof) and of the fact that for all probability measure on $\mathbb{Z}$ with finite support, we can find a probability on $\mathbb{Z}$ with same support which is arbitrarily close to the first one (with respect to d) and takes values in $\mathbb{Q}$. $\square$

The following lemma is classical, we do not give a proof.

Lemma 2.4 *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a Lebesgue probability space and ν be a probability on $\mathbb{R}$. Then, there exists a measurable random variable $X : \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $\mathcal{L}_\Omega(X) = \nu$.*

Recall that a set $F \in \mathcal{A}$ is the base of a Rokhlin tower of height n if the sets $F, TF, \dots, T^{n-1}F$ are pairwise disjoint.

Lemma 2.5 *For all $n \geq 1$ and for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a set $F \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\{F, \dots, T^{n-1}F\}$ is a Rokhlin tower of measure greater than $1 - \varepsilon$ and the sojourn time in the junk set $J = \Omega \setminus (\cup_{i=0}^{n-1} T^i F)$ is almost surely 1, i.e. for a.e. $x \in J$, $Tx \in F$.*

Proof.

This can be view as a consequence of Alpern's theorem [1], by constructing a Rokhlin castle with two towers of height n and $n + 1$ and the base of the second tower of measure less than ε . $\square$

2.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Let the sequence $(\nu_k)_{k \geq 1}$ in $\mathcal{M}_0$ and the constant $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be fixed. Let $(\varepsilon_k)_{k \geq 1}$ be a decreasing sequence of positive reals such that $\sum_{k \geq 1} \varepsilon_k < \varepsilon$ and $\sum_{k \geq 1} k\varepsilon_k < \infty$.

Theorem 3 is a consequence of the following proposition, which is proved in the next section.

Proposition 2.6 *There exist a sequence of pairwise disjoint sets $A_k \in \mathcal{A}$ and a sequence of integers $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$ such that,*

$$(i) \quad \mu(A_1) \leq \varepsilon_1 \text{ and for all } k > 1, \mu(A_k) \leq \frac{a_{n_k-1}}{n_{k-1}} \varepsilon_k;$$

$$(ii) \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1,$$

$$d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_k}} S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_{A_k} - \mu(A_k))), \nu_k) \leq \varepsilon_k;$$

$$(iii) \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1 \text{ and for all } j > k,$$

$$d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_j}} S_{n_j}(\mathbb{1}_{A_k} - \mu(A_k))), \delta_0) \leq \varepsilon_j.$$

We admit the proposition for the end of the proof.

Set

$$A = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} A_k.$$

Then by (i),

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \mu(A_k) \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \varepsilon_k \leq \varepsilon.$$

By Proposition 2.6 and by (iii) and (iv) of Lemma 2.2, for all $j \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_j}}S_{n_j}(\mathbb{1}_A - \mu(A))), \nu_j) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_j}}S_{n_j}(\mathbb{1}_{A_i} - \mu(A_i))), \delta_0) \\
&\quad + d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_j}}S_{n_j}(\mathbb{1}_{A_j} - \mu(A_j))), \nu_j) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=j+1}^{\infty} d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_j}}S_{n_j}(\mathbb{1}_{A_i} - \mu(A_i))), \delta_0) \\
&\leq (j-1)\varepsilon_j + \varepsilon_j + \sum_{i=j+1}^{\infty} \frac{n_j}{a_{n_j}} \mu(A_i) \\
&\leq \sum_{i \geq j} i\varepsilon_i
\end{aligned}$$

which goes to 0 when j goes to ∞ . Thus Theorem 3 is proved.

2.4 Proof of Proposition 2.6

We give an explicit construction of the sets A_k . We begin by the construction of the set A_1 .

Step 1: the set A_1

The goal is to find a set A_1 and an integer n_1 such that

$$d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_1}}S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_1} - \mu(A_1))), \nu_1) \leq \varepsilon_1.$$

But we also want that the set A_1 becomes negligible for the partial sums of length n_k , $k \geq 2$ (condition (iii)). There are several steps. First, we will define a set $A_{1,1}$ which satisfies (ii) and (iii) for $j = 2$. Then, we will modify this set, step by step, to have (iii) for all $j > 2$.

The set $A_{1,1}$

We consider the probability ν_1 , the constant ε_1 and we set $\alpha_1 := \frac{\varepsilon_1}{8}$. Applying Lemma 2.3 to ν_1 and α_1 , we get two constants $C(\nu_1, \alpha_1)$ and $n(\nu_1, \alpha_1)$ and we choose $C_1 := C(\nu_1, \alpha_1)$ and $n_1 \geq n(\nu_1, \alpha_1)$ such that

$$\frac{d_1}{n_1} \leq \alpha_1 \quad \text{where } d_1 := \lfloor a_{n_1} C_1 \rfloor + 1. \quad (1)$$

We get a corresponding centered probability η_1 (given by Lemma 2.3) with support in $\{-d_1 + 1, \dots, d_1 - 1\}$ such that $d(\eta_1, \nu_1) \leq \alpha_1$. Since for all i , $\eta_1(\{i\}) \in \mathbb{Q}$, there exist $q_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q_1^{(i)} \in \mathbb{N}$, $i = 1 \dots, 2d_1$, such that

$$\eta_1(\{i - d_1\}) = \frac{q_1^{(i)}}{q_1}, \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, 2d_1.$$

Now, we consider the probability ν_2 and ε_2 . We define $\alpha_2 := \frac{a_{n_1}}{2n_1}\varepsilon_2$. Applying Lemma 2.3 to ν_2 and α_2 , we get two constants $C(\nu_2, \alpha_2)$ and $n(\nu_2, \alpha_2)$. Set $C_2 := \max\{C(\nu_2, \alpha_2), C_1\}$ and let $n_2 \geq n(\nu_2, \alpha_2)$ be a multiple of $q_1 n_1$ such that

$$\frac{q_1 n_1}{a_{n_2}} \leq \alpha_2. \quad (2)$$

By Lemma 2.5, we can consider a set $F_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\{F_1, TF_1, \dots, T^{n_2-1}F_1\}$ is a Rokhlin tower of height n_2 , with the sojourn time in the junk set almost surely equal to 1 and the measure of the junk set smaller than $\gamma_1 := \min\{\frac{a_{n_2}}{n_2}\alpha_2, \alpha_1\}$. Write $F_1^l := T^{ln_1}F_1$, $l = 0, \dots, p_1 - 1$. We thus have $p_1 := \frac{n_2}{n_1}$ towers $\{F_1^l, \dots, T^{ln_1-1}F_1^l\}$ of height n_1 . Notice that by definition of n_2 , p_1 is a multiple of q_1 .

By Lemma 2.4, let h_1 be a measurable function from F_1 to $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathcal{L}_{F_1}(h_1) = \eta_1$ and denote by g_1 the positive function equal to $h_1 + d_1$. Let

$$A_{F_1, i} := g_1^{-1}(\{i\}), \quad i = 1, \dots, 2d_1.$$

Now, for all $i = 1, \dots, 2d_1$, let $\{A_{F_1, i, 1}, \dots, A_{F_1, i, q_1^{(i)}}\}$ be a partition of the set $A_{F_1, i}$ into sets of measure $\frac{1}{q_1}\mu(F_1)$. We thus have a partition of F_1 into

$$\{A_{F_1, 1, 1}, \dots, A_{F_1, 1, q_1^{(1)}}, A_{F_1, 2, 1}, \dots, A_{F_1, 2, q_1^{(2)}}, \dots, A_{F_1, 2d_1, 1}, \dots, A_{F_1, 2d_1, q_1^{(2d_1)}}\}.$$

By induction, we define partitions of F_1^l for $l = 1, \dots, p_1 - 1$ by setting

$$A_{F_1^l, i, j} := \begin{cases} T^{n_1} A_{F_1^{l-1}, i, j+1} & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq q_1^{(i)} - 1 \\ T^{n_1} A_{F_1^{l-1}, i+1, 1} & \text{if } j = q_1^{(i)} \text{ and } i < 2d_1 \\ T^{n_1} A_{F_1^{l-1}, 1, 1} & \text{if } j = q_1^{(2d_1)} \text{ and } i = 2d_1 \end{cases}.$$

For all $l = 0, \dots, p_1 - 1$ and for all $i = 1, \dots, 2d_1$, we set

$$A_{F_1^l, i} := \bigcup_{j=1}^{q_1^{(i)}} A_{F_1^l, i, j}$$

and

$$A_{F_1^l} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{2d_1} \bigcup_{k=0}^{i-1} T^k A_{F_1^l, i}.$$

Remark that for any $l \in \{0, \dots, p_1 - 1\}$, for any $x \in F_1^l$ and for any $i \in \{1, \dots, 2d_1\}$,

$$x \in A_{F_1^l, i} \text{ if and only if } S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{F_1^l}})(x) = i.$$

Now, we define the set $A_{1,1}$ as follows

$$A_{1,1} := \bigcup_{l=0}^{p_1-1} A_{F_1^l}.$$

Remark that for any $x \in F_1$, $S_{n_1 q_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}})(x) = d_1 q_1$ and since p_1 is a multiple of q_1 , $S_{n_2}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}})(x) = d_1 p_1$. Moreover, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, \frac{n_2}{n_1 q_1}\}$, for any $x \in T^{k n_1 q_1} F_1$, we also have $S_{n_1 q_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}})(x) = d_1 q_1$.

Lemma 2.7

- (i) $\mu(A_{1,1}) \leq \alpha_1$;
- (ii) $A_{1,1} \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{p_1-1} \bigcup_{i=0}^{2d_1-1} T^{i+jn_1} F_1$;
- (iii) $d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_1}} S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}} - \mu(A_{1,1}))), \nu_1) \leq \varepsilon_1$;
- (iv) $d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_2}} S_{n_2}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}} - \mu(A_{1,1}))), \delta_0) \leq \alpha_2$.

Proof.

For each $l = 0, \dots, p_1 - 1$, $\mu(A_{F_1^l}) = \mathbb{E}_{F_1}(g_1)\mu(F_1) = d_1\mu(F_1)$. Therefore, by (1),

$$\mu(A_{1,1}) = \sum_{l=0}^{p_1-1} \mu(A_{F_1^l}) = p_1 d_1 \mu(F_1) \leq \frac{p_1}{n_2} d_1 = \frac{d_1}{n_1} \leq \alpha_1.$$

By construction, (ii) is clear.

Let $\Omega_1 := \bigcup_{l=0}^{p_1-1} \bigcup_{i=0}^{n_1-2d_1-1} T^{-i} F_1^l$. We have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_1}(S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}})) = \mathcal{L}_{F_1}(g_1)$$

and since $\mathbb{E}_{F_1}(g_1) = d_1$, by centering,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Omega_1}(S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}} - \mu(A_{1,1}))) = \mathcal{L}_{F_1}(h_1).$$

Now, since $\gamma_1 \leq \alpha_1$,

$$\mu(\Omega_1) = p_1(n_1 - 2d_1)\mu(F_1) \geq (n_2 - 2p_1 d_1) \frac{(1 - \gamma_1)}{n_2} = 1 - \gamma_1 - \frac{2d_1}{n_1} \geq 1 - 3\alpha_1.$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.2 (i),

$$d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}} - \mu(A_{1,1}))), \mathcal{L}_{F_1}(h_1)) \leq 3\alpha_1.$$

and by Lemma 2.2 (ii),

$$d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_1}} S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}} - \mu(A_{1,1}))), \mathcal{L}_{F_1}(\frac{h_1}{a_{n_1}})) \leq 3\alpha_1.$$

We infer, by triangular inequality, that

$$d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_1}}S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}} - \mu(A_{1,1}))), \nu_1) \leq \varepsilon_1$$

and (iii) is proved.

Recall that n_2 is a multiple of n_1q_1 and, by definition of $A_{1,1}$, $S_{n_1q_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}})(x) = d_1q_1$ whenever x belongs to one of the $T^{kn_1q_1}F_1$ for $k = 0, \dots, \frac{n_2}{n_1q_1}$. Since the sojourn time in the junk set is 1, we infer that for any $x \in \Omega$,

$$(p_1 - q_1)d_1 \leq S_{n_2}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}})(x) \leq (p_1 + q_1)d_1.$$

Using $\mu(A_{1,1}) = p_1d_1\mu(F_1)$, we get

$$|S_{n_2}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}} - \mu(A_{1,1}))| \leq p_1d_1|1 - n_2\mu(F_1)| + q_1d_1 \leq p_1d_1\gamma_1 + q_1d_1.$$

Thus, since $\gamma_1 \leq \frac{a_{n_2}}{n_2}\alpha_2$ and by (2), we have

$$\frac{1}{a_{n_2}}|S_{n_2}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,1}} - \mu(A_{1,1}))| \leq \frac{d_1}{n_1}\alpha_2 + \frac{d_1}{n_1}\frac{q_1n_1}{a_{n_2}} \leq 2\alpha_1\alpha_2 \leq \alpha_2$$

and (iv) follows from application of Lemma 2.2 (iv). $\square$

Of course, the set $A_{1,1}$ is not defined well enough to be negligible for higher partial sums. So, we need to modify a small part of $A_{1,1}$. Thus we introduce a sequence of sets $A_{1,k}$, $k \geq 2$. The set $A_{1,1}$ can be considered as a first version of the set A_1 and the $A_{1,k}$, $k \geq 2$ are the adjustments.

The sets $A_{1,k}$, $k \geq 2$

We shall give here the general algorithm to deduce the set $A_{1,k}$ from $A_{1,k-1}$. To do that, we need first to define the entire sequence $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$.

By induction, we define the sequences $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 2}$, $(C_k)_{k \geq 2}$, $(n_k)_{k \geq 2}$, $(q_k)_{k \geq 2}$ as follows. We consider the probability ν_k and ε_k . We define $\alpha_k := \frac{a_{n_{k-1}}}{2n_{k-1}}\varepsilon_k$. Applying Lemma 2.3 to ν_k and α_k , we get two constants $C(\nu_k, \alpha_k)$ and $n(\nu_k, \alpha_k)$. Set $C_k := \max\{C(\nu_k, \alpha_k), C_{k-1}\}$ and let $n_k \geq n(\nu_k, \alpha_k)$ be a multiple of $q_{k-1}n_{k-1}$ such that

$$\frac{d_k}{n_k} \leq \alpha_k \quad \text{where } d_k := \lfloor a_{n_k} C_k \rfloor + 1. \quad (3)$$

and

$$\frac{q_{k-1}n_{k-1}}{a_{n_k}} \leq \alpha_k. \quad (4)$$

By Lemma 2.3, we get a corresponding centered probability η_k on $\{-d_k + 1, \dots, d_k - 1\}$ such that $d(\eta_k a_{n_k}, \nu_k) \leq \alpha_k$. There exist $q_k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q_k^{(i)} \in \mathbb{N}$, $i = 1, \dots, 2d_k$, such that $\eta_k(\{i - d_k\}) = \frac{q_k^{(i)}}{q_k}$.

For $k \geq 1$, we also set $p_k := \frac{n_{k+1}}{n_k} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta_k := \alpha_k - \alpha_{k+1}$. Thus, for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{j \geq k} \beta_j \leq \alpha_k. \quad (5)$$

We define the sequence $(\gamma_k)_{k \geq 1}$ by

$$\gamma_k := \min \left\{ \frac{\beta_{k+1}}{2p_{k+1}}, \frac{a_{n_{k+1}}}{n_{k+1}} \alpha_{k+1} \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Further, for all $k \geq 1$, by application of Lemma 2.5, we obtain a set $F_k \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\{F_k, TF_k, \dots, T^{n_{k+1}-1}F_k\}$ is a Rokhlin tower of height n_{k+1} and the junk set $J_k := \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{n_{k+1}-1} T^i F_k$ is a set with sojourn time 1 and $\mu(J_k) \leq \gamma_k$.

Remark that α_2 , n_2 and γ_2 have been previously defined but they respect this new definition.

We also introduce the sequence of sets F'_k defined by induction in the following way: $F'_1 := F_1$ and

$$F'_k := \bigcup_{x \in F_k} T^{n(x)} x.$$

where for all x in F_k , $n(x) := \inf\{n \geq 0 / T^n x \in F'_{k-1}\}$ is the time of the first visit in F'_{k-1} .

Lemma 2.8 *There exists a sequence of measurable sets $(A_{1,k})_{k \geq 1}$ such that*

- (i) $\mu(A_{1,k-1} \triangle A_{1,k}) \leq \beta_k$;
- (ii) for all $x \in \Omega$, $S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k}})(x) \leq 2d_1$;
- (iii) for all $x \in F'_k$, for all $i = 0, \dots, p_k - 1$, $S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k}} \circ T^{in_k})(x) = \frac{n_k}{n_1} d_1$;
- (iv) $d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_{k+1}}} S_{n_{k+1}}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k}} - \mu(A_{1,k})), \delta_0) \leq \alpha_{k+1}$.

Proof.

We prove the lemma by induction. The set $A_{1,1}$ is already defined.

Now, for a fixed k , we are going to explain how to deduce the set $A_{1,k}$ from $A_{1,k-1}$.

For $x \in F'_k$ and $i = 0, \dots, p_k - 1$, let

$$\rho_i(x) := \sum_{j=in_k}^{(i+1)n_k-1} \mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k-1}} \circ T^j(x) = S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k-1}} \circ T^{in_k}).$$

By hypothesis, for all $x \in F'_k$, $\rho_0(x) = S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k-1}})(x) = p_{k-1} \frac{n_{k-1}}{n_1} d_1 = \frac{n_k}{n_1} d_1$ but for $i > 0$ it can be different. The differences appear when the orbit of the point x meets the junk

set J_{k-1} . Nevertheless, by definition of the Rokhlin tower (see Lemma 2.5), it can meet J_{k-1} only one time in every n_k consecutive iterates by T . So we have, $(p_{k-1} - 1)\frac{n_{k-1}}{n_1}d_1 \leq \rho_i(x) \leq (p_{k-1} + 1)\frac{n_{k-1}}{n_1}d_1$. To summarize, for $x \in F'_k$ and $i = 0, \dots, p_k - 1$,

$$\rho_i(x) = \frac{n_k}{n_1}d_1 + j$$

with $j \in \{-\frac{n_{k-1}}{n_1}d_1, \dots, \frac{n_{k-1}}{n_1}d_1\}$.

We define a set $B_i(x)$ as follows. If $j \geq 0$, $B_i(x) = \emptyset$. If $j < 0$, let $B_i(x)$ be a set composed by $|j|$ points from the set $\{T^{in_k}x, \dots, T^{(i+1)n_k-1}x\} \setminus A_{1,k-1}$, in such a way that every n_1 -consecutive points in $\{T^{in_k}x, \dots, T^{(i+1)n_k-1}x\}$ meet $A_{1,k-1} \cup B_i(x)$ at most $2d_1$ times (it is possible because otherwise, $\rho_i(x) > \frac{n_k}{n_1}2d_1 - |j| \geq \frac{n_k}{n_1}d_1$).

We define a set $C_i(x)$ as follows. If $j \leq 0$, $C_i(x) = \emptyset$. If $j > 0$, let $C_i(x)$ be the set composed by the j first points of $\{T^{in_k}x, \dots\} \cap A_{1,k-1}$.

Let

$$B := \bigcup_{x \in F'_k} \bigcup_{i=0}^{p_k-1} B_i(x) \quad , \quad C := \bigcup_{x \in F'_k} \bigcup_{i=0}^{p_k-1} C_i(x)$$

and

$$A_{1,k} := (A_{1,k-1} \setminus C) \cup B.$$

Since the orbit of a point x can only meet J_{k-1} one time every n_k and using (6), we have

$$\mu(A_{1,k-1} \triangle A_{1,k}) \leq 2p_k \mu(J_{k-1}) \leq 2p_k \gamma_{k-1} \leq \beta_k.$$

Remark that (ii) and (iii) are guaranteed by construction of $A_{1,k}$.

Further for all $x \in F'_k$, we have

$$S_{n_{k+1}}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k}})(x) = p_k \frac{n_k}{n_1}d_1 = \frac{n_{k+1}}{n_1}d_1.$$

We deduce that $|\mu(A_{1,k}) - \frac{n_{k+1}}{n_1}d_1 \mu(F'_k)| \leq \mu(J_k)$ and

$$(p_k - 1) \frac{n_k}{n_1}d_1 \leq S_{n_{k+1}}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k}}) \leq (p_k + 1) \frac{n_k}{n_1}d_1.$$

Then,

$$|S_{n_{k+1}}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k}} - \mu(A_{1,k}))| \leq \frac{n_k}{n_1}d_1 + (1 + \frac{n_{k+1}}{n_1}d_1)\mu(J_k)$$

and by (6) and (4),

$$\frac{1}{a_{n_{k+1}}} |S_{n_{k+1}}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k}} - \mu(A_{1,k}))| \leq \frac{n_k}{a_{n_{k+1}}} \frac{d_1}{n_1} + (\frac{1}{n_{k+1}} + \frac{d_1}{n_1})\alpha_{k+1} \leq \alpha_{k+1}.$$

By Lemma 2.2 (iv), we get (iv). □

The set A_1

We can now define the set $A_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ as

$$A_1 := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_{1,k}$$

which is well defined because the sequence $(\mu(A_{1,k} \triangle A_{1,k+1}))_{k \geq 1}$ is summable.

Lemma 2.9

- (i) $\mu(A_1) \leq 2\alpha_1$;
- (ii) $S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_1}) \leq 2d_1$;
- (iii) $d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_1}}S_{n_1}(\mathbb{1}_{A_1} - \mu(A_1))), \nu_1) \leq 2\varepsilon_1$;
- (iv) For all $k \geq 2$, $d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_k}}S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_{A_1} - \mu(A_1))), \delta_0) \leq \varepsilon_k$.

Proof.

For all $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\mu(A_1 \triangle A_{1,k}) \leq \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \mu(A_{1,j-1} \triangle A_{1,j}) \leq \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} \beta_j \leq \alpha_{k+1} \quad (7)$$

and then $\mu(A_1) \leq \mu(A_{1,1}) + \mu(A_1 \triangle A_{1,1}) \leq 2\alpha_1$.

Assertion (ii) comes from Lemma 2.8 (ii).

Further (7) and Lemma 2.2 (iv) imply that for all n ,

$$d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_n}(S_n(\mathbb{1}_{A_{1,k}} - \mu(A_{1,k})) - S_n(\mathbb{1}_{A_1} - \mu(A_1)))), \delta_0) \leq \frac{n}{a_n}\alpha_{k+1}.$$

Using Lemma 2.2 (iii), we can deduce (ii) from Lemma 2.7 (iii) and (iii) from Lemma 2.8 (iv). $\square$

Step 2: The set A_2

The set $A_{2,2}$

We consider $F_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ and we will almost repeat what we did to find the set $A_{1,1}$, working with n_2, q_2, p_2, d_2 instead of n_1, q_1, p_1, d_1 . The difference comes to the fact that we want $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$. Recall that η_2 is the probability measure with support in $\mathbb{Z}$ given by Lemma 2.3 applied to ν_2 and α_2 and with constants C_2 and n_2 . Let h_2 be a function from F_2 to $\mathbb{Z}$ given by Lemma 2.4 such that $\mathcal{L}_G(h_2) = \eta_2$ and call g_2 the positive function equal to $h_2 + d_2$. Let

$$A_{F_2,i} := g_2^{-1}(\{i\}), \quad i = 1, \dots, 2d_2$$

and for all $i = 1, \dots, 2d_2$, let $\{A_{F_2,i,1}, \dots, A_{F_2,i,q_2^{(i)}}\}$ be a partition of the set $A_{F_2,i}$ into sets of measure $\frac{1}{q_2}\mu(F_2)$. We thus have a partition of F_2 into

$$\{A_{F_2,1,1}, \dots, A_{F_2,1,q_2^{(1)}}, A_{F_2,2,1}, \dots, A_{F_2,2,q_2^{(2)}}, \dots, A_{F_2,2d_1,1}, \dots, A_{F_2,2d_1,q_2^{(2d_1)}}\}.$$

By induction, we deduce partitions of $F_2^l = T^{ln_2}F_2$ for $l = 1, \dots, p_2 - 1$. We set

$$A_{F_2^l,i,j} := \begin{cases} T^{n_2} A_{F_2^{l-1},i,j+1} & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq q_2^{(i)} - 1 \\ T^{n_2} A_{F_2^{l-1},i+1,1} & \text{if } j = q_2^{(i)} \text{ and } i < 2d_2 \\ T^{n_2} A_{F_2^{l-1},1,1} & \text{if } j = q_2^{(2d_1)} \text{ and } i = 2d_2 \end{cases}.$$

For all $l = 0, \dots, p_2 - 1$ and for all $i = 1, \dots, 2d_2$, we set

$$A_{F_2^l,i} := \bigcup_{j=1}^{q_2^{(i)}} A_{F_2^l,i,j}.$$

Because we want disjointness, we cannot define $A_{F_2^l}$ as $\bigcup_{i=1}^{2d_2} \bigcup_{k=0}^{i-1} T^k A_{F_2^l,i}$. So, for each $l \in \{0, \dots, p_2 - 1\}$, for each $x \in F_2^l$, if $x \in A_{F_2^l,i}$, we denote by $D_l(x)$ the set composed by the i first elements of $\{x, Tx, \dots\} \setminus A_1$ and we set

$$D_l := \bigcup_{x \in F_2^l} D_l(x).$$

Since A_1 contains at most $2d_1$ points in each orbit of size n_1 and since $d_2 \geq d_1$,

$$D_l \subset \bigcup_{i=0}^{4d_2-1} T^i F_2^l.$$

We define $A_{2,2}$ as

$$A_{2,2} := \bigcup_{l=0}^{p_2-1} D_l.$$

Lemma 2.10

- (i) $\mu(A_{2,2}) \leq \alpha_2$;
- (ii) $S_{n_2}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{2,2}}) \leq 2d_2$;
- (iii) $d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_2}} S_{n_2}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{2,2}} - \mu(A_{2,2}))), \nu_2) \leq \varepsilon_2$;
- (iv) $d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_3}} S_{n_3}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{2,2}} - \mu(A_{2,2}))), \delta_0) \leq \alpha_3$.

Proof.

The proof follows the one of Lemma 2.7 and is left to the reader. □

The sets $A_{2,k}$, $k \geq 3$

Now we define a sequence $A_{2,k}$, $k \geq 3$ using the same techniques as before and preserving the fact that for all $k \geq 1$, $A_{1,k}$ contains at most $2d_2$ points in each orbit of length n_2 .

Then the $A_{2,k}$ satisfy

$$\mu(A_{2,k-1} \triangle A_{2,k}) \leq \beta_k$$

and

$$d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_{k+1}}} S_{n_{k+1}}(\mathbb{1}_{A_{2,k}} - \mu(A_{2,k}))), \delta_0) \leq \alpha_{k+1}.$$

The set A_2

The set

$$A_2 := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_{2,k}$$

is well defined, disjoint of A_1 and satisfies the following lemma.

Lemma 2.11

- (i) $\mu(A_2) \leq 2\alpha_2$;
- (ii) $S_{n_2}(\mathbb{1}_{A_2}) \leq 2d_2$;
- (iii) $d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_2}} S_{n_2}(\mathbb{1}_{A_2} - \mu(A_2))), \nu_2) \leq 2\varepsilon_2$;
- (iv) For all $k \geq 3$, $d(\mathcal{L}_\Omega(\frac{1}{a_{n_k}} S_{n_k}(\mathbb{1}_{A_2} - \mu(A_2))), \delta_0) \leq \varepsilon_k$.

Proof.

The proof follows the one of Lemma 2.9. □

Step k: the set A_k , $k \geq 3$

It is now clear that, by induction, we can find sets A_k disjoint of the sets A_i , $i < k$, satisfying Proposition 2.6. □

References

- [1] Steve Alpern. Generic properties of measure preserving homeomorphisms. In *Ergodic theory (Proc. Conf., Math. Forschungsinst., Oberwolfach, 1978)*, volume 729 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 16–27. Springer, Berlin, 1979.
- [2] Robert Burton and Manfred Denker. On the central limit theorem for dynamical systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 302(2):715–726, 1987.
- [3] Andrés del Junco and Joseph Rosenblatt. Counterexamples in ergodic theory and number theory. *Math. Ann.*, 245(3):185–197, 1979.

- [4] R. M. Dudley. *Real analysis and probability*, volume 74 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002. Revised reprint of the 1989 original.
- [5] Olivier Durieu and Dalibor Volný. On sums of indicator functions in dynamical systems. *to appear in Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*.
- [6] Pierre Liardet and Dalibor Volný. Sums of continuous and differentiable functions in dynamical systems. *Israel J. Math.*, 98:29–60, 1997.
- [7] Dalibor Volný. On limit theorems and category for dynamical systems. *Yokohama Math. J.*, 38(1):29–35, 1990.